## **INDOT 2030 Plan Update Early Coordination Meeting Notes**

LaPorte District Meeting in LaPorte, IN May 27th 1:30 PM -4:00 PM

In Attendance: Don Abraham, INDOT LaPorte District Office

Lisa Shrader, INDOT LaPorte District Office Jamile Smith, INDOT LaPorte District Office Steve Smith, INDOT Central Office, Planning Roy Nunnally, INDOT, Central Office, Planning

Steve Smith kicked the meeting off discussing the meeting's purpose and expected outcome. The outline of the meeting was structured based on projects and issues sited by the planning section; project discussed in last fall's call for project meeting; and the district's response letter to the Early Coordination 2004 long range plan update letter sent to the district in April. This letter requested INDOT Districts and MPO personnel to reevaluate major expansion projects in the INDOT 25-year plan for their areas and document changes in project priorities (changes in scope, and/or project deletion, delay, or advancement); identify new expansion projects to be evaluated for inclusion in INDOT's 2030 plan update; and develop a list of planning issues the MPO/District faces that should be addressed in the 2030 plan update. Listed below are topics/issues discussed.

## PROJECT EVALUATION DISCUSSIONS

1. Proposed Illiana (South Suburban) Expressway Alignment - INDOT list a "Placeholder" project in its current plan as an undetermined South Suburban Transportation Need improvement, RFC 2028. The district had general comments relative to a previous preferred alignment on Illinois portion of the expressway. The district notes the alignment was closer to the north than today year ago. Recent developments to regions north of the proposed Illinois alignment as well as development the northern region of Indiana continues to push the alignment to the south which will continue to loose its proposed benefits to drawing traffic, emphasis on truck traffic from the Borman. The district notes its initial proposal alignment would terminate at US 431 to the existing US 30.

**Comment:** *No Comments* 

2. CR 300 Extension (Proposed SR 149) Improvement – INDOT explained that this project will not carried over to our 2030 plan due to the significant project cost increase from \$4 to \$32 million. The district notes that this was a local project that INDOT would take over, however a field check identified bad soil which increased construction cost significantly. The district supports not including the proposed project in INDOT's upcoming plan update.

**Comment:** The INDOT Planning Section will not include project # 744 in INDOT next plan update due to a significant reduction in the cost/benefit ratio for this project. Demonstration funds for this project have been pulled.

3. New Interchange Project on I-94 and County Line Road – The planning section notes that this project was removed from the INDOT plan in the 2003 update due to lack of planning support and recommendation made by the district. The planning section notes that Michigan City has re-submitted a proposal to include the project in the INDOT and MPO Plan. The planning section requested background information from the district relative to the project and the need. The district notes the project was a local recommended project submitted to the district in the early 1980's to serve the National Lakeshore. The district agreed that it would not move on this project until the two counties responsible for County Line Road, upgrade the facility to accommodate additional traffic from a new interchange. The district proposed a diamond interchange and note no ROW would be needed. District does not see a need for this project unless, County Line Road is upgraded or if the MPO sees a need for the project. The district notes that the project was purpose has been change to serve the River Boat Casino and the Outlet Malls.

**Comment:** The INDOT planning section will continue coordinating efforts with both the district and Northwestern Indiana MPO to evaluate the need for the proposed interchange and to develop local consensus.

4. <u>SR 55</u>, <u>Added Capacity/Relinquishment</u> – The planning section requested input from the district relative to adding capacity to SR 55 from US 30 to Ridge Road. The planning section recapped expressed interests in widening SR 55 and relinquishing the facility to either the county or City of Merrillville. The Planning section also notes that planning analysis did not identify capacity problems on the existing 4-lane facility. The district also could not identify deficiencies but identified TSM project # 433 listed in the INDOT plan as a potential capacity problem area in the near future. The district notes that the Engineer's Report to be conducted for this proposed project in the near future could provide additional information relative to entire corridor.

**Comment:** The project is beyond the scope of the Long Range Planning Section. Needs to add capacity on SR 55 from US 30 to Ridge Road have not been identified. The project continues to be a relinquishment issues and should be handled by INDOT's Relinquishment Specialist and Program Development.

5. Proposed SR 312 Extension – The Planning Section notes that the City of Hammond requested this project to improve safety, and provide better connectivity to Illinois's Brainard Ave but is considered a controversial project for Gary residents. The planning section requested additional information relative to SR 312. The district notes the facility needs a lot of work and is a possible relinquishment issue. The district would like to relinquish this facility since it does not connect to a state route in Illinois. The district notes that SR 312 is a heavily used truck route and feels the project is not a bad project, but still would like to relinquish the facility.

**Comment:** The project currently has serious consensus issues and has not been officially proposed to be included in INDOT's 2030 Plan. This project is also a relinquishment issue. Programming should be included in any decisions to include the project in the 2030 Plan.

6. US 20 from US 421 to US 35/SR 212 in Michigan City – INDOT currently list this project as LRP project # 573, Added Travel Lanes (4-6 Lanes) HERS\_IN recommended improvement, RFC Date 2008. The district notes it does not see a need for added capacity on US 20 west of US 421. The district notes a continuous left-turn lane (5th-lane) would suffice. The district also recommends advanced ROW acquisition for an additional lane in the future during the construction of the left-turn lane as ROW may become limited as time progress.

**Comment:** Based on the district's and the MPO recommendation for a left-turn lane (Median Construction), the planning section will change the project type in the 2030 plan to reflect these recommendations.

7. SR 53 from 109<sup>th</sup> to US 231 – INDOT currently lists an Added Travel Lanes project from 109<sup>th</sup> Ave to 93<sup>rd</sup> Ave, RFC Date 2007 in our plan. The both the district and sub-district recommends extending the project limit down from 109<sup>th</sup> Ave. to US 231 as a logical termini point and for connectivity.

**Comment:** The planning section concur, US 231 would be a logical termini for the SR 53 project. The planning section will continue to evaluate extending the project limits based on fiscal constraint. (NIRPC also supports the district's recommendation)

8. <u>US 41 from 93<sup>rd</sup> Ave to US 231</u> – INDOT currently lists an Added Travel Lanes project from 77<sup>th</sup> Ave to 93<sup>rd</sup> Ave, RFC Date 2009 in our plan. The both the district and subdistrict recommends extending the project limit down from 93<sup>rd</sup> Ave. to US 231 as a logical termini and connectivity.

**Comment:** The planning section concur, US 231 would be a logical termini for the US 41 project. The planning section will continue to evaluate extending the project limits based on fiscal constraint. (NIRPC also supports the district's recommendation)

9. <u>US 20 from Olive to Quince Road</u> - INDOT lists an Added Travel Lanes project for this segment, LRP project # 314, RFC 2016. The district notes it has plans to relinquish US 20 from S to US 31. A potential new alignment would be constructed just south of the existing due to South Bend's Airport expansion. This new alignment would shift the US 20/US 31 interchange to the Edison Road area. The district notes that both the LaPorte and St. Joseph Counties need to be involved.

**Comment:** The planning section will continue coordinating efforts with both the district and MPO's to determine if the project should be removed from the INDOT plan.

10. <u>US 6 SR 149 to SR 49</u> – This project is listed in the INDOT plan as project # 399, Des No. 0014510, added travel lanes, RFC Date 2007. The project is not warrant at the 2007 suggested RFC date recommended in the current INDOT 25-Year Transportation Plan. The planning section proposes moving the project into the 2012 2020 time frame. The district supports moving the project out to the future years.

**Comment:** The project has been suspended in SPMS. The INDOT Planning Section will removed the project from the INDOT transportation plan project list and incorporate two project for the SR 149 to SR 49 segment. Also, NIRPC notes added travel lanes are not needed and recommends a continuous left-turn lane, plus access management strategies to preserve peak LOS.

- 11. <u>I-65 and the Proposed 101<sup>st</sup> and 109<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange Locations</u> The district notes the 109<sup>th</sup> location would provide better regional connectivity and notes that Purdue University supports the 101<sup>st</sup> location. The district also notes that the I-65 and US 30 interchange modification works extremely well which further supports the 109<sup>th</sup> location. **Comment:** *The planning section will consider the district's recommendation along with recommendation from the MPO.*
- 12. <u>SR 912 Corridor</u> INDOT lists an added travel lanes project # 439, Des No. 0014030, from 0.63 mile N. of the Borman to N. of US 12. The District notes this project is not needed at this time and should be pushed back into a later timeframe.

  Comment: The project has been programmed in SPMS. The Planning Section will contact the programming section to determine if the project could be push out into a later time frame. The planning section will also need to coordinate this proposed action with the MPO for air quality conformity reasons.

## **PLANNING ISSUES**

None

## **OTHER ISSUES**

- <u>US 31 and Adams Road</u> The district notes that a developer wants a new Interchange at US 31 and Adams Road just north of the west toll road.
- <u>SR 912 just north of SR 312</u> The district plan to re-propose a reconstruction project on SR 912 to the north of SR 312
- <u>SR 14 near I-65</u> The district plan to propose a road reconstruction project on SR 14 post completion of the new interchange at I-65 and SR 14.
- <u>US 35 from SR 18 to US 24</u> The district commented on the 2030 build and no-build network LOS analysis for this segment which forecast a LOS of "D&E" on the 05/25/04 networks and would like additional information relative to this segment and what the planning section recommends for improvement.
- <u>US 24 from US 421 to 6<sup>th</sup> Street</u> The district commented on the 2030 build and no-build network LOS analysis for this segment which forecasts a deficient LOS.
- <u>I-94 and US 20/35 Interchange</u> The district notes that US 35 intersection need to be realigned further east of the exiting to improve weaving and accident problems at the intersection.